



## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/540,563	12/07/2005	Taichi Kobayashi	Q88775	6718
23373	7590	12/16/2008	EXAMINER	
SUGHRIE MION, PLLC			JONES, JAMES	
2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W.				
SUITE 800			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
WASHINGTON, DC 20037			2873	
		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
		12/16/2008	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

**Advisory Action  
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

**Application No.**

10/540,563

**Examiner**

JAMES C. JONES

**Applicant(s)**

KOBAYASHI ET AL.

**Art Unit**

2873

**-The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address -**

THE REPLY FILED 20 November 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a)  The period for reply expires \_\_\_\_ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
 b)  The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
 Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**NOTICE OF APPEAL**

2.  The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

**AMENDMENTS**

3.  The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because  
 (a)  They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  
 (b)  They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);  
 (c)  They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or  
 (d)  They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4.  The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).

5.  Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.

6.  Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a)  will not be entered, or b)  will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_

Claim(s) rejected: 1-7

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_

**AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE**

8.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

9.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fail to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10.  The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

**REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER**

11.  The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  
See Continuation Sheet

12.  Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_

13.  Other: \_\_\_\_\_

/Ricky L. Mack/  
 Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2873

/James C. Jones/  
 Examiner, Art Unit 2873

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Continuation of 11. NOTE: I. Applicant argues that Yoshiro does not disclose or suggest "a coating area of the electrode provided on two substrates". Applicant argues that Yoshiro does not disclose or suggest "a coating area of the electrode provided on two substrates respectively is patternized with respect to a projected area of respective cell" and that a person having ordinary skill in the art would clearly understand that arranging the display lateral electrode and the back lateral electrode in a particular order is not the same as patterning a coating area of the electrode provided on two substrates respectively with respect to a projected area of respective cells. However, giving the word pattern or patterning (definition: forming a consistent or characteristic arrangement, see: <http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/pattern>) its broadest interpretation, the electrodes in figures 2(a) and 2(b) are formed in a consistent arrangement and are therefore patterned. A person having ordinary skill in the art clearly understands that the word pattern or patterning can have more than one meaning such as "etching" or "forming a consistent pattern" but as to avoid any ambiguity the claims are rejected on there most broadest interpretation and therefore, the applicant should claim the invention with greater clarity.

II. Applicant argues that Yoshiro does not teach the coating area of the electrodes provided on two substrates respectively is patterned with respect to a projected area of respective cells because the electrode coating area covers substantially 100% of the projected area of the respective cells. However, fig. 2(a) and 2(b) clearly suggest that the electrodes do not cover 100% of the respective cells because they do not extend all the way to across the cell to contact element "26". There is a gap between "26" and electrode "22" on both sides.

III. Applicant argues that Yoshiro does not teach that in arranging the image display panel vertically in a stationary manner, the electrode is patternized in such a manner that no electrode portion is formed at a vertically lower portion in respective cells. However, if the image display panel in fig. 2(a) of Yoshiro was turned vertically then there would not be any portion of the electrode "22" or "25" at a vertically lower portion in respective cells because the electrodes "22" or "25" do not extend across their respective cells to contact element "26". .